Reply to Office Action of January 13, 2005

Docket No. 0512-1179

## REMARKS

The application has been amended and is believed to be in condition for allowance.

Claims 15-20 have been canceled without prejudice and may be the subject of a continuing application filed at any time during the pendency of the present application.

New dependent claims 21-23 respectively recite that the workstation may be one of an incubator, an oven, and a refrigerator. Support for these recitations can be found at least on specification page 20.

Claim 1 stands rejected under §112, second paragraph, as indefinite.

The claim has been amended as suggested by the Official Action and to remedy the stated basis of rejection. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection is solicited.

Claims 1-6 and 12-14 stand rejected as anticipated by MANN et al. 6,614,351.

Claims 7-11 stand rejected as obvious over MANN et al. in view of WORNER et al. UK 2 371 722.

The dependent claims are believed allowable at least for depending from an allowable independent claim. Further, the independent claim is believed to be both novel and nonobvious over the prior art and specifically over the applied art.

Application No. 10/647,342
Reply to Office Action of January 13, 2005
Docket No. 0512-1179

In order for the independent claim to be anticipated, each feature recited therein must be disclosed by the anticipatory reference. In order for the independent claim to be rendered obvious, each feature recited therein must be either taught or suggested by the reasonable combination of the applied references.

The references, taken either individually or in any reasonable combination thereof, do not anticipate or render obvious the present invention as they do not teach each feature recited therein.

MANN discloses a method for monitoring the handling of objects by workers. In that regard, each worker wears a glove 3 provided with an antenna 15 connected via a personal computer 5 to a computer data network 21 to communicate with a database 33. The objects 9 are provided with RFID tags 11. Accordingly, the workers implicitly acquire information when handling the objects.

However, MANN does not disclose a workstation for carrying out a treatment operation as recited in the independent claim. Nor does MANN recite a workstation as recited in the new dependent claims. That is, there is no disclosure of a workstation being an incubator, an oven, or a refrigerator.

MANN is silent about such an enclosure where the objects 9 could be subject to a treatment. As a matter of fact, the objects 9 are parcels and there is no reason to implement a

Reply to Office Action of January 13, 2005

Docket No. 0512-1179

treatment on such objects, provided they can withstand such a treatment.

Further, MANN shows no interest in the location where objects 9 may be placed or stored and is silent about the identification of such places.

Thus, MANN does not disclose the recited workstation for carrying out a product treatment operation being equipped with means for emitting radiofrequency waves to supply work station identification information, as recited in claim 1.

Accordingly, claim 1 is novel over MANN.

WORNER, in turn, discloses a freezer with shelves 4. Each shelf is provided with an antenna 6 for receiving information emitted by tags carried by objects to be stored in the freezer. The freezer 1 has a display for indicating the location of the objects within the freezer. This reference, however, does not provide the missing features of MANN.

WORNER does not disclose such an enclosure, since the freezer 1 has antennas for receiving information transmitted by the stored articles but is not able and is not intended to provide information concerning its own identity. Assuming that one of skill in the art would have combined MANN and WORNER, this combination still lacks the feature relating to the means for emitting radio frequency waves to supply work station identification information.

Application No. 10/647,342 Reply to Office Action of January 13, 2005

Docket No. 0512-1179

Finally, there is no proper motivation for combining MANN with WORNER since there is no hint that the parcels 9 of MANN would need to be and could be stored in the freezer of WORNER without any damage.

Accordingly, independent claim 1 is not anticipated nor rendered obvious. Further, there is no reason to combine these two references. Still further, even if combined, the references would not teach the recitations.

In view of the above, claim 1 is believed to be patentable. Reconsideration and allowance of all the pending claims are respectfully requested.

Applicants believe that the present application is in condition for allowance and an early indication of the same is respectfully requested.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 25-0120 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17.

Respectfully submitted,

YOUNG & THOMPSON

Roland E. Long, Jr., Reg. (No.)41,949

745 South 23<sup>rd</sup> Street Arlington, VA 22202 Telephone (703) 521-2297 Telefax (703) 685-0573

REL/mjr May 11, 2005